

EXHIBIT 27

**REDACTED VERSION OF
DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE
SEALED**

From: John Mark Suhy (jmsuhy@purethink.com)
To: Philip Rathle (philip@neo4j.com)
CC:
BCC:
Subject: Re: Touching base
Attachments: purethink Mail - IRS breakdown.pdf; april-2016-email-number-5-agreement.pdf;
Sent: 05/21/2018 02:46:30 PM -0700 (PST)

Please give me some time to digest your proposal and see if this makes sense from a business perspective for us. I probably will have some questions, In fact I have one right offhand.

Question:

If we were to consider what you proposed, would you require us to waive our right to pursue our claims, such as tortious interference against Neo4j Inc in the future? I believe we can work together moving forward, and in parallel let the courts decide what is fair for the past. We have invested quite a bit of time and money into preparation based on the statute of limitations, and I would think that you would also say it is fair to let the courts work out what is right - if we agree to accept the court's decision and move on.

Beyond that question,

In order to trust us, I think based on your email response, you should really just peak at the attachments I re-attached to this email. Not to prove anything, but to show that you should be wary of taking one side of the story from John and Jason. These attachments are just so you keep an open mind when working with us. Please read them - they are attached, short and can help our relationship. I highlighted them to make it quick.

On another note, regarding the licensing, you may want to consider the implications of going closed source right now.

I completely understand where you are coming from, and you have a tough decision to make. I wouldn't want to be in your position regarding that topic, so I respect that you are in a precarious position and have to make a decision.

My biggest worry does not have to do with you going closed source, but with how the community reacts. As you can imagine, there will be probably be several community forks of Neo4j if you go the closed source router. An unorganized fork without the proper governance model can lead to the community being in the same situation as they would be with you if you do go closed source. It would force us to do a proper fork that addresses governance, meaning spending time I don't feel like spending. But it would be needed for the Government.

I've already done the preparation to create non profit organization with the necessary bylaws and governance model for a community fork of Neo4j to get things started, and to ensure it's long term success (if adopted).

We took guidance from MariaDb and my mentors on how to do it right and for the community, I am very confident that this will benefit the community.

By design, if we do launch this community fork and re-brand , it won't be something I can stop once the legal entity is in place and launched, which is the point of ensuring the community has control.

I am not sure how it would effect our working together, but as you can guess - it could actually hurt us all if we end up making this partnership work and this fork becomes popular.

Let me know if there is a time Friday that you want to catch up for a call.

Have a good day,

Sincerely,

John Mark Suhy
PureThink
jmsuhy@purethink.com
703-862-7780
<http://purethink.com>

REDACTED - CONFIDENTIAL



REDACTED - CONFIDENTIAL



REDACTED - CONFIDENTIAL



REDACTED - CONFIDENTIAL



REDACTED - CONFIDENTIAL

